REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 14-8 and 11-15 are currently pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over newly cited Aholainen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,102,640, hereafter "Aholainen") in view of previously cited Rune et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,901,057, hereafter "Rune"). Claims 4, 6-7, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aholainen in view of Rune and further in view of Olkkonen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0088980, hereafter "Olkkonen). Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aholainen in view of Rune and further in view of Muthuswamy et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0204151, hereafter "Muthuswamy"). In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

The Examiner asserts that Aholainen teaches all of the features of independent claim 1 and analogous independent claims 8 and 15 except for the element "wherein the device information is contained in unused portions of a frequency hop synchronization (FHS) packet used for an inquiry response message, and the unused portions of the FHS packet are an Undefined field and an AM_ADDR field". The Examiner thus relies on Rune to allegedly cure this conceded deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

Aholainen generally relates to a communication method which gives the user of a Bluetooth device notice of Bluetooth devices within communication range, and selectively

blocks any notice about devices that the user wishes to ignore (column 7, lines 7-13). Bluetooth server devices can indicate to the user's Bluetooth client device the service the service device has available by sewing service/device icon information to the Bluetooth client device (the Abstract).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references for at least the feature "a control unit for providing, through the user interface, information on the peripheral devices connectable to a wireless communication device, and, if said at least one desired device is selected from among the peripheral devices through the user interface, establishing a connection to only said at least one desired device, and not attempting a connection to at least one undesired device which is not selected by the user from among the peripheral devices connectable to a wireless communication device", as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

The Examiner cites FIG. 1A, column 2, lines 36-44 and column 11, lines 18-39 of Aholainen as allegedly teaching this aspect of the claims. However, Aholainen discloses that, to form ad hoc connections, a Bluetooth device should have the ability to rapidly discover target Bluetooth devices to which the user wishes to connect (column 2, lines 36-40). Aholainen further teaches that if a client device has initiated a connection with a server device 140, the client device assumes a temporary master role in its piconet. The client device is programmed to terminate the connection after completing any Service Discovery Protocol (SDP) searching. Further, in order to continue displaying icons of server devices within communication range of the client device, the client device continues to operate in inquiry and page scanning modes to detect FHS paging and inquiry response packets from server devices in its vicinity (column 11, lines 18-39).

Nowhere does Aholainen teach or suggest "if said at least one desired device is selected from among the peripheral devices through the user interface, establishing a connection to only said at least one desired device, and not attempting a connection to at least one undesired device which is not selected by the user from among the peripheral devices connectable to a wireless communication device", as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

According to this aspect of the present invention, a controller provides, through a user interface, information on connectable peripheral devices in a range connectable to a wireless communication device, and if a device that a user wishes to be connected to has been selected by the user, connection is established with the selected device and connections with the other devices is released. Accordingly, the mobile device establishes a connection to the selected device only, and does not attempt connection to the other devices.

Although not clear, the Examiner appears to read the claimed "at least one desired device" on the network icon (160, FIG. 1A) of Aholainen. However, Aholainen clearly discloses that the icon 160 connects to is used for connection to the network and not to a device as claimed. Further, even if Aholainen selects the icon 160 to be connected to the network, it also appears that a connection is also possible with the other network devices (143, 145, and 147) (column 7, lines 24-48).

Additionally, although Aholainen discloses that the user can enter class of device (CoD) values for various types of server devices to be ignored (column 13, lines 19-27), we note that would mean that certain devices would not be presented to the user. Accordingly, the user would not be apprised of all of the peripheral devices that are connectable to the user device, since some

of the connectable devices may be blocked. This differs from the present invention where all of the devices in a communicable range of the client device are presented to the user and, if the user selects a connection to a device he or she wishes to be connected to from the displayed list, the mobile phone establishes a connection to the selected device only, and does not attempt a connection to the other devices.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 should be allowable because the cited references so not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. Claims 4-7 and 11-14 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 8

Respectfully submitted,

S. Stuart Lee #61,124
for Mark E. Wallerson
Registration No. 59,043

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 21, 2008